Docket-222
CS 94-48
MM 92-265

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

SEP 26 1994

IN REPLY REFER TO:
CN-94C4388

RECEIVED
OCT - 5 1994
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

The Honorable Sam Nunn
United States Senate
75 Spring Street, S.W.
Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30303

Dear Senator Nunn:

This is in response to your inquiry on behalf of a constituent, Mr. George A. Dyson, President of Wilkes Communications, Inc. Mr. Dyson is concerned that DirecTV, operator of a direct broadcast satellite (DBS) facility, cannot obtain rights to Time Warner and Viacom programming, because such programming is subject to exclusive distribution rights of another DBS distributor, United States Satellite Broadcasting, Inc.

Mr. Dyson also expresses his support for the position of the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative concerning the Commission's interpretation of Section 19 of the 1992 Cable Act. NRTC has requested that the Commission reexamine the legality of exclusive contracts between vertically integrated cable programmers and DBS providers in areas unserved by cable operators. NRTC has asked that the Commission determine that such contracts are prohibited.

NRTC's petition for reconsideration of the Commission program access rulemaking proceeding is currently pending. As such, any discussion by Commission personnel concerning this issue outside the context of the rulemaking would be inappropriate. However, you may be assured that the Commission will take into account each of the arguments raised by NRTC and the other parties to the rulemaking concerning this issue to arrive at a reasonable decision on reconsideration.

I trust this information is responsive to your inquiry.

Sincerely,

Meredith J. Jones

Meredith J. Jones
Chief, Cable Services Bureau

No. of Copies rec'd 2
List ABCDE

CD
CAH-95
4388

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

FIELD OPERATIONS BUREAU
ATLANTA OFFICE

3575 Koger Blvd. Suite 320 • Duluth, Georgia • 30D136 (404) 279-4621 • fbroce@fcc.gov

August 30, 1994

COPY

Honorable Sam Nunn
U.S. Senate
75 Spring Street, SW
Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30303

Dear Senator Nunn:

Your letter to Laura J. Belvin, Acting Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, has been referred to me for reply.

We are forwarding your letter to our Field Operations Bureau for referral to the appropriate FCC bureau that handles Cable Act issues.

Sincerely,

Fred L. Broce
Engineer in Charge

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6050

August 25, 1994

Ms. Laura J. Belvin, Acting Director
Office of Legislative Affairs
Federal Communications Commission
3575 Koger Boulevard, Suite 320
Duluth, Georgia 30136

Dear Ms. Belvin:

Attached is a communication within your authority. Because of my desire to be of assistance to my constituents, I will appreciate your giving this request every possible consideration that is consistent with relevant agency guidelines and regulations.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this matter. I will look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Sam Nunn

Enclosure

SN/cja

PLEASE REPLY TO:
75 Spring Street, S.W.
Attn: Corey Anderson
Suite 1700
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Wilkes Communications, Inc.

COMM # 420367

94 AUG 22 AM 11:12
ATLANTA OFFICE

ATLC - Copy

July 22, 1994

The Honorable Sam Nunn
U. S. SENATE
303 Dirksen Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Nunn:

I am writing this letter to express a concern I have regarding the implementation and enforcement of Section 19 of the 1992 Cable Act by the Federal Communications Commission.

As a distributor of DIRECTV direct broadcast satellite (DBS) television service in a five county area in Northeastern Georgia, equal access to cable and broadcast programming at fair rates-something which we are not receiving-is essential for my company to be competitive in our local marketplace.

To give you more information on my concern I am attaching a copy of my letter to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt. In addition, I am attaching a copy of a letter from The Honorable Billy Tauzin of Louisiana and other Representatives expressing those same concerns to Mr. Hundt.

It was my understanding and belief that when Congress passed the Cable Act of 1992, it guaranteed equal access to cable and broadcast programming for all distributors. Despite this fact, however, satellite distributors, such as my company, and my consumers continue to be treated unfairly by the cable industry.

Some programmers continue to charge unfairly high rates for satellite distributors compared with cable rates. Other programmers-like Time Warner and Viacom-have simply refused to sell programming, like the popular channels HBO, Showtime, etc., to some distributors. These exclusive practices hurt rural consumers and thwart the effective competition required by Section 19 of the Cable Act.

Post Office Box 70 • 110 E Liberty Street • Washington, Georgia 30673 • Phone 706/678-3663

I would greatly appreciate your assistance on behalf of my rural consumers in Northeastern Georgia in encouraging the FCC to correct this inequity.

Sincerely,

George A. Dyson
President

LBH/dwb

Attachments (2)

Wilkes Communications, Inc.

July 22, 1994

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 814
Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: CABLE COMPETITION REPORT
CS DOCKET NO. 94-48

Dear Chairman Hundt:

I am writing this letter in support of the Comments of the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative (NRTC) in the matter of Implementation of Section 19 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming, CS Docket No. 94-48.

As a rural telephone member of NRTC and a distributor of the DIRECTV direct broadcast satellite (DBS) television service, my company is directly involved in bringing satellite television to rural consumers in a five county area in Northeastern Georgia. Many of my potential customers for DBS live in rural areas that are too sparsely populated to receive Cable TV. These rural customers have little choice other than satellite for receiving quality television service. Therefore, I need access to all programming at fair rates, comparable to those paid by my competition in the local marketplace.

However, despite passage of the 1992 Cable Act, my company's ability to compete in my local marketplace is being hampered by my lack of access to programming owned by Time Warner and Viacom. This programming, which includes some of the most popular cable networks like HBO, Showtime, Cinemax, The Movie Channel, MTV, Nickelodeon and others, is available only to my principal competitor, the United States Satellite Broadcasting Co. (USSB), as a result of an "exclusive" contract signed between USSB and Time Warner/Viacom. In contrast, none of the programming distribution contracts signed by DIRECTV are exclusive in nature, and USSB is free to obtain distribution rights for any of the channels available on DIRECTV. This is clearly an unlevel playing field.

Post Office Box 70 • 110 E. Liberty Street • Washington, Georgia 30673 • Phone 706/678-3663

Mr. Hundt, my company agrees with the NRTC that these exclusive programming contracts run counter to the intent of the 1992 Cable Act. I believe the Act prohibits any arrangement that prevents any distributor from gaining access to programming to serve non-cabled rural areas. Under the present circumstance if one of my DIRECTV subscribers also wishes to receive Time Warner/Viacom Products, that subscriber must purchase a second subscription to the USSB service. This hinders effective competition and keeps the price of the Time Warner/Viacom channels unnecessarily high. It also increases consumer confusion and frustration at the retail level.

Not having access to the Time Warner/Viacom services will also adversely affect my ability to compete against other sources for television in my area. While we are just getting started in our area with DIRECTV, customers who have already signed up for service and those who are inquiring about the service just do not understand why they can't purchase HBO, Showtime and other popular channels from my company.

I believe very strongly that the 1992 Cable Act clearly prohibits any exclusive arrangements that prevent any distributor from gaining access to cable programming to serve rural non-cabled areas. That is why the industry supported the Tauzin Amendment, embodied in Section 19 of the Cable Act.

I ask on behalf of my company that the FCC remedy these problems and obstacles so that effective competition as intended in Section 19 of the Cable Act become a reality in rural America.

I strongly urge you and your colleagues to banish the anti-competitive and exclusionary arrangements represented by the USSB/Time Warner Viacom deal.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

George A. Dyson
President

LBH/dwb

xc: William F. Caton, Secretary
The Hon. James H. Quello
The Hon. Andrew C. Barrett
The Hon. Susan Ness
The Hon. Rachelle B. Chong

BILLY TAUZIN
THIRD DISTRICT, LOUISIANA

ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN, COAST GUARD AND
NAVIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
TELEPHONE: 202-225-4031
2330 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-1803

DISTRICT OFFICES:

TELEPHONE: 504-589-8368
501 MAGAZINE STREET
SUITE 1041
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

TELEPHONE: 504-876-3033
FEDERAL BUILDING, SUITE 107
HOUMA, LA 70360

TELEPHONE: 318-387-8231
210 EAST MAIN STREET
NEW IBERIA, LA 70560

TELEPHONE: 504-621-8490
ASSUMPTION PARISH COURTHOUSE EAST
828 SOUTH IRMA BLVD.
GONZALES, LA 70737

June 15, 1994

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Hundt:

We are writing to ask your help in strengthening the Commission's rulemaking on competition and diversity in video programming distribution.

During the past year a great deal of the energy has necessarily been devoted to the issue of cable rate regulation. Notwithstanding the immediate importance of that issue, many Members of Congress believe that the true answer to improving the video programming distribution marketplace is the promotion of real competition. In the long run we believe that competition – not regulation – will achieve the greatest benefits for consumers and result in greater vitality in the industry. Of the many provisions of the Cable Act that are designed to promote competition, none are more important than Section 19, which instructs the Commission to ensure nondiscriminatory access to cable programming by all distributors.

We strongly believe that section 19 is worthy of your serious and immediate attention. We respectfully request that you reexamine the Commission's First Report and Order implementing section 19 in order to eliminate potential loopholes that would permit the denial of programming to any non-cable distributor.

We wish to call to your attention certain disquieting developments heightening our concern about the FCC's program access regulations. We are troubled by the Primestar consent decrees and the effect they may have on program access. We believe the FCC's program access regulations need to be tightened if the full force and effect of Section 19 of the 1992 Cable Act is to be preserved.

As you may be aware, despite the Commission's well-reasoned brief opposing the entry of the state Primestar decree, the court entered final judgment. Among other things, the state consent decree will permit the vertically integrated cable programmers that own Primestar to enter into exclusive contracts with one direct broadcast satellite (DBS) operator to the exclusion of all other DBS providers at each orbital position. On the other hand, Primestar's ability to obtain all of the programming of its cable owners will be unimpeded by the state consent decree. In its opinion, the court made clear, however, that its ruling was in no way a judgment about the propriety of such exclusive contracts under Section 19 of the Cable Act

or the FCC's implementing regulations and specifically left that question open to be decided by the FCC.

In essence, the state consent decree gives Primestar's cable owners the ability to carve up the DBS market to the competitive disadvantage of non-cable owned DBS providers. This is directly contrary to the intent of Congress. In enacting the program access provisions, Congress specifically rejected the existing market structure in which vertically integrated cable companies controlled the distribution of programming. Congress and the FCC recognized that vertically integrated programmers had both the means and the incentives to use their control over program access to discriminate against cables' competitors and to choke off potential competition, even in unserved areas. Moreover, Congress looked to DBS as a primary source of competition to cable, not as a new technology to be captured by the cable industry.

Congress enacted very strong program access provisions and gave the Commission broad authority to regulate against anti-competitive and abusive practices by vertically integrated programmers. Section 628 (b) makes it unlawful for a cable operator or vertically integrated cable programmer "to engage in unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices, the purpose or effect of which is to hinder significantly or to prevent any multichannel video programming distributor" from providing cable or superstation programming to consumers. Section 628 (c) provides the Commission with the authority to promulgate regulations to effectuate the statutory prohibition and delineates their minimum content.

Upon examination of the program access regulations, we have discovered a critical loophole that seems ripe for exploitation by the cable industry and is directly applicable to exclusive contracts between vertically integrated cable programmers and DBS providers. Section 628 (c) (2) (c) of the 1992 Cable Act contains a broad per se prohibition on "practices, understandings, arrangements, and activities, including exclusive contracts for satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming between a cable operator and a satellite cable programming vendor or satellite broadcast programming vendor, that prevent a multichannel video programming distributor from obtaining such programming from any satellite cable programming vendor in which a cable operator has an attributable interest" for distribution in non-cabled areas. However, Section 76.1002 (c) (1) of the Commission's new rules covers only those exclusionary practices involving cable operators.

The Commission's rule in its present form is inconsistent with both the plain language of the statute and Congressional intent. The prohibition against all exclusionary practices by vertically integrated programmers in unserved areas is clear. While it certainly includes exclusive contracts between cable operators and vertically integrated programmers, the language of the statute does not limit the prohibition to that one example. The regulations incorrectly turn the illustrative example into the rule.

This loophole must be closed and the program access regulation strengthened on Reconsideration. The Primestar consent decree alone makes it clear that the bare minimum regulation of exclusive contracts is insufficient to guard against anti-competitive practices by vertically integrated cable programmers. The Commission's final regulations should provide, as does the legislation, that all exclusive practices, understandings, arrangements and activities, including (but not limited to) exclusive contracts between vertically integrated video programmers and any multichannel video programming distributor are per se unlawful in non cabled areas. In cabled areas, all such exclusive contracts should be subject to a public interest test with advanced approval required from the Commission.

There is one other vital point to note regarding the Commission's program access rules. It has become evident that the cable industry has been attempting to manipulate the Commission's reconsideration proceeding to obtain an overly broad Commission declaration as to the general propriety of exclusive contracts with non-cable multichannel video programming distributors. Any such pronouncement by the Commission would eviscerate the program access protections of the 1992 Cable Act.

Specifically, in addition to and independent of the explicit exclusive contracting limitations imposed by the Act, exclusive arrangements between vertically integrated programmers and non-cable multichannel video programming distributors (MVPD) in many circumstances also violate Section 628(b)'s general prohibition of "unfair practices" which hinder significantly or prevent any MVPD from obtaining access to cable programming. In addition, they may violate Section 528 (c)(2)(B)'s prohibition against discrimination by a vertically integrated satellite cable programming vendor in the prices, terms and conditions of sale or delivery of satellite cable programming "among or between cable systems, cable operators, or other multichannel video programming distributors." Accordingly, we urge the Commission to be extremely careful in its decision on reconsideration to avoid any ruling or language which could, in any way, limit the protections against discrimination afforded by Sections 628(b) and (c)(2)(B).

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential in overview that the Commission add regulatory "teeth" to its Program Access regulations. In the Program Access decision, the Commission generally declined to award damages as a result of a Program Access violation. Without the threat of damages, however, we see very little incentive for a programmer to comply with the rules. Nor is it practical to expect an aggrieved multichannel video programming distributor to incur the expense and inconvenience of prosecuting a complaint at the Commission without an expectation of an award of damages. There is ample statutory authority for the Commission to order "appropriate remedies" for program access violations, and we urge the Commission to use such authority to impose damages (including attorney fees) in appropriate cases. [See, 47 U.S.C. 548 (e) (i)].

DBS has long been viewed as a strong potential competitor to cable if it were able to obtain programming. In the 1992 Cable Act, Congress acted definitively to remove that barrier to full and fair DBS entry into the multichannel video programming distribution market. We think it is of the utmost importance that there be no loopholes which would allow cable or, in light of recent merger activity, cable-telco combinations to dominate the DBS marketplace.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

cc: The Hon. James H. Quello
The Hon. Andrew C. Barrett
The Hon. Susan Ness
The Hon. Rachelle B. Chong

RICK BOUCHER
Member of Congress

BILLY TAUZIN
Member of Congress

RON WYDEN
Member of Congress

JIM COOPER
Member of Congress

JIM SLATTERY
Member of Congress

BLANCHE LAMBERT
Member of Congress

RALPH HALL
Member of Congress

MIKE SYNAR
Member of Congress

CC#. 420435

Washington Electric Membership Corporation

258 North Harris Street
Post Office Box 598
Sandersville, Georgia 31082
Telephone (912) 552-2577

July 20, 1994

The Honorable Senator Sam Nunn
United States Senate
303 Dirksen Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Nunn:

I am writing this letter to voice a concern I have regarding the implementation and enforcement of Section 19 of the 1992 Cable Act by the Federal Communications Commission.

As a distributor of DBS/C-band satellite television programming, equal access to cable and broadcast programming at fair rates - something which we are not currently receiving - is essential for Washington EMC to be competitive in our local marketplace.

The attached letters to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt from myself, in addition to Rep. Billy Tauzin and other members of Congress, spell out my concerns on this issue.

It was my impression that Congress had guaranteed equal access to cable and broadcast programming for all distributors with the passage of the 1992 Cable Act. Despite this fact, however, satellite distributors and consumers continue to be treated unfairly by the cable industry.

Some programmers continue to charge unfairly high rates for satellite distributors compared with cable rates. Other programmers - like Time Warner and Viacom - have simply refused to sell programming to some distributors. These exclusive practices hurt rural consumers and thwart the effective competition required by Section 19 of the Cable Act.

I would greatly appreciate your assistance on behalf of rural consumers in Georgia in encouraging the FCC to correct this inequity.

Sincerely,

Robert S. Moore
General Manager

"Owned By Those We Serve"

Washington Electric Membership Corporation

258 North Harris Street
Post Office Box 598
Sandersville, Georgia 31082
Telephone (912) 552-2577

July 20, 1994

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, Room 814
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Cable Competition Report
CS Docket No. 94-48

Dear Chairman Hundt:

This letter is in support of the Comments of the National Rural Telecommunications Cooperative (NRTC) in the matter of implementation of Section 19 of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992, Annual Assessment of the Status of Competition in the Market for the Delivery of Video Programming, CS Docket No. 94-48.

Washington EMC, as a rural electric member of NRTC and distributor of the DIRECTV™ direct broadcast satellite (DBS) television service, is directly involved in bringing satellite television to rural consumers.

The majority of our member consumers live in rural areas that are too sparsely populated to receive cable TV. These rural households have little choice other than satellite for receiving television services. Washington EMC needs complete access to all programming at fair rates, comparable to those paid by our competition, in order to compete in our marketplaces.

Currently we do not have DBS distribution rights for Time Warner and Viacom programming, like HBO, Showtime, Cinemax, The Movie Channel, VH-1, MTV, Nickelodeon, etc., because of the "exclusive" distribution arrangements they have made with United States Satellite Broadcasting Co. Inc. (USSB). It was our understanding that Congress had already solved this problem two years ago with the passage of the 1992 Cable Act. We briefly question why other distributors (PrimeStar, Wireless Cable, etc.) have access to HBO and Showtime and we do not.

In contrast, none of the programming distribution contracts signed by DIRECTV are exclusive in nature, and USSB is free to obtain distribution rights for any of the channels available on DIRECTV.

If one of our DIRECTV subscribers also wishes to receive Time Warner/Viacom product, that subscriber must purchase a second subscription to the USSB service. This hinders effective competition, and as a consequence keeps the price of the Time Warner/Viacom channels unnecessarily high. It also increases consumer confusion at the retail level.

If these services were offered by both DIRECTV and USSB, consumers would be able to choose their service provider, resulting in the primary benefits of effective competition: lower prices and improved service.

Chairman Hundt, we agree with NRTC's position that the FCC should act to enforce the wishes of Congress as put forth in the 1992 Cable Act. We strongly encourage you to monitor and combat the problems we have mentioned by banishing the type of exclusionary arrangements represented by the USSB/Time Warner/Viacom deal.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT S. MOORE
General Manager

RSM:kbr

cc: The Honorable Cynthia McKinney
The Honorable J. Roy Rowland
The Honorable Sam Nunn
The Honorable Paul Coverdell
William F. Caton, Secretary
The Honorable James H. Quello
The Honorable Andrew C. Barrett
The Honorable Susan Ness
The Honorable Rachelle B. Chong

BILLY TAUZIN
THIRD DISTRICT, LOUISIANA

ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE
CHAIRMAN, COAST GUARD AND
NAVIGATION SUBCOMMITTEE

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
TELEPHONE: 202-225-4031
2330 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-1803

DISTRICT OFFICES:

TELEPHONE: 504-589-6388
801 MAGAZINE STREET
SUITE 1041
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

TELEPHONE: 504-876-3033
FEDERAL BUILDING, SUITE 107
HOUMA, LA 70360

TELEPHONE: 318-387-8231
210 EAST MAIN STREET
NEW IBERIA, LA 70560

TELEPHONE: 504-621-8430
ASSUMPTION PARISH COURTHOUSE ANNEX
828 SOUTH IRMA BLVD.
GONZALES, LA 70737

June 15, 1994

The Honorable Reed Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Chairman Hundt:

We are writing to ask your help in strengthening the Commission's rulemaking on competition and diversity in video programming distribution.

During the past year a great deal of the energy has necessarily been devoted to the issue of cable rate regulation. Notwithstanding the immediate importance of that issue, many Members of Congress believe that the true answer to improving the video programming distribution marketplace is the promotion of real competition. In the long run we believe that competition -- not regulation -- will achieve the greatest benefits for consumers and result in greater vitality in the industry. Of the many provisions of the Cable Act that are designed to promote competition, none are more important than Section 19, which instructs the Commission to ensure nondiscriminatory access to cable programming by all distributors.

We strongly believe that section 19 is worthy of your serious and immediate attention. We respectfully request that you reexamine the Commission's First Report and Order implementing section 19 in order to eliminate potential loopholes that would permit the denial of programming to any non-cable distributor.

We wish to call to your attention certain disquieting developments heightening our concern about the FCC's program access regulations. We are troubled by the Primestar consent decrees and the effect they may have on program access. We believe the FCC's program access regulations need to be tightened if the full force and effect of Section 19 of the 1992 Cable Act is to be preserved.

As you may be aware, despite the Commission's well-reasoned brief opposing the entry of the state Primestar decree, the court entered final judgment. Among other things, the state consent decree will permit the vertically integrated cable programmers that own Primestar to enter into exclusive contracts with one direct broadcast satellite (DBS) operator to the exclusion of all other DBS providers at each orbital position. On the other hand, Primestar's ability to obtain all of the programming of its cable owners will be unimpeded by the state consent decree. In its opinion, the court made clear, however, that its ruling was in no way a judgment about the propriety of such exclusive contracts under Section 19 of the Cable Act

or the FCC's implementing regulations and specifically left that question open to be decided by the FCC.

In essence, the state consent decree gives Primestar's cable owners the ability to carve up the DBS market to the competitive disadvantage of non-cable owned DBS providers. This is directly contrary to the intent of Congress. In enacting the program access provisions, Congress specifically rejected the existing market structure in which vertically integrated cable companies controlled the distribution of programming. Congress and the FCC recognized that vertically integrated programmers had both the means and the incentives to use their control over program access to discriminate against cables' competitors and to choke off potential competition, even in unserved areas. Moreover, Congress looked to DBS as a primary source of competition to cable, not as a new technology to be captured by the cable industry.

Congress enacted very strong program access provisions and gave the Commission broad authority to regulate against anti-competitive and abusive practices by vertically integrated programmers. Section 628 (b) makes it unlawful for a cable operator or vertically integrated cable programmer "to engage in unfair methods of competition or unfair or deceptive acts or practices, the purpose or effect of which is to hinder significantly or to prevent any multichannel video programming distributor" from providing cable or superstation programming to consumers. Section 628 (c) provides the Commission with the authority to promulgate regulations to effectuate the statutory prohibition and delineates their minimum content.

Upon examination of the program access regulations, we have discovered a critical loophole that seems ripe for exploitation by the cable industry and is directly applicable to exclusive contracts between vertically integrated cable programmers and DBS providers. Section 628 (c) (2) (c) of the 1992 Cable Act contains a broad per se prohibition on "practices, understandings, arrangements, and activities, including exclusive contracts for satellite cable programming or satellite broadcast programming between a cable operator and a satellite cable programming vendor or satellite broadcast programming vendor, that prevent a multichannel video programming distributor from obtaining such programming from any satellite cable programming vendor in which a cable operator has an attributable interest" for distribution in non-cabled areas. However, Section 76.1002 (c) (1) of the Commission's new rules covers only those exclusionary practices involving cable operators.

The Commission's rule in its present form is inconsistent with both the plain language of the statute and Congressional intent. The prohibition against all exclusionary practices by vertically integrated programmers in unserved areas is clear. While it certainly includes exclusive contracts between cable operators and vertically integrated programmers, the language of the statute does not limit the prohibition to that one example. The regulations incorrectly turn the illustrative example into the rule.

This loophole must be closed and the program access regulation strengthened on Reconsideration. The Primestar consent decree alone makes it clear that the bare minimum regulation of exclusive contracts is insufficient to guard against anti-competitive practices by vertically integrated cable programmers. The Commission's final regulations should provide, as does the legislation, that all exclusive practices, understandings, arrangements and activities, including (but not limited to) exclusive contracts between vertically integrated video programmers and any multichannel video programming distributor are per se unlawful in non cabled areas. In cabled areas, all such exclusive contracts should be subject to a public interest test with advanced approval required from the Commission.

There is one other vital point to note regarding the Commission's program access rules. It has become evident that the cable industry has been attempting to manipulate the Commission's reconsideration proceeding to obtain an overly broad Commission declaration as to the general propriety of exclusive contracts with non-cable multichannel video programming distributors. Any such pronouncement by the Commission would eviscerate the program access protections of the 1992 Cable Act.

Specifically, in addition to and independent of the explicit exclusive contracting limitations imposed by the Act, exclusive arrangements between vertically integrated programmers and non-cable multichannel video programming distributors (MVPD) in many circumstances also violate Section 628(b)'s general prohibition of "unfair practices" which hinder significantly or prevent any MVPD from obtaining access to cable programming. In addition, they may violate Section 628 (c)(2)(B)'s prohibition against discrimination by a vertically integrated satellite cable programming vendor in the prices, terms and conditions of sale or delivery of satellite cable programming "among or between cable systems, cable operators, or other multichannel video programming distributors." Accordingly, we urge the Commission to be extremely careful in its decision on reconsideration to avoid any ruling or language which could, in any way, limit the protections against discrimination afforded by Sections 628(b) and (c)(2)(B).

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, it is absolutely essential in overview that the Commission add regulatory "teeth" to its Program Access regulations. In the Program Access decision, the Commission generally declined to award damages as a result of a Program Access violation. Without the threat of damages, however, we see very little incentive for a programmer to comply with the rules. Nor is it practical to expect an aggrieved multichannel video programming distributor to incur the expense and inconvenience of prosecuting a complaint at the Commission without an expectation of an award of damages. There is ample statutory authority for the Commission to order "appropriate remedies" for program access violations, and we urge the Commission to use such authority to impose damages (including attorney fees) in appropriate cases. [See, 47 U.S.C. 548 (e) (i)].

DBS has long been viewed as a strong potential competitor to cable if it were able to obtain programming. In the 1992 Cable Act, Congress acted definitively to remove that barrier to full and fair DBS entry into the multichannel video programming distribution market. We think it is of the utmost importance that there be no loopholes which would allow cable or, in light of recent merger activity, cable-telco combinations to dominate the DBS marketplace.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

cc: The Hon. James H. Quello
The Hon. Andrew C. Barrett
The Hon. Susan Ness
The Hon. Rachelle B. Chong



RICK BOUCHER
Member of Congress



BILLY TAUZIN
Member of Congress

RON WYDEN
Member of Congress



JIM COOPER
Member of Congress



JIM SLATTERY
Member of Congress



BLANCHE LAMBERT
Member of Congress



RALPH HALL
Member of Congress



MIKE SYNAR
Member of Congress